

**BDAC Ecosystem Roundtable Meeting  
20 February 1997**

**Attendee List**

Roundtable Members

John Beuttler  
Gary Bobker  
Bill Gaines  
Greg Gartrell  
Randy Kanouse

Cynthia Koehler  
Marc Luesebrink  
John Mills  
Jason Peltier

Tim Quinn  
Allen Short  
David Yardas  
Tom Zuckerman

Other Participants

Laurel Ames  
Rich Atwater  
Roberta Borgonova  
Kathy Clement  
Cindy Darling  
Greg Elliott  
Rick Frank  
Zeke Grader  
Kate Hansel  
Perry Herrgesell  
Steve Hirsch  
Sarah Holmgren  
Linda Hunter  
Jeff Jaraczski

Jan Jennings  
Marti Kie  
Bob Koenigs  
John Kopchik  
Jordan Lang  
Eugenia Laychak  
Roger Masuda  
Earl Nelson  
Jeremy Pratt  
Tim Ramirez  
Robin Reynolds  
Pete Rhoads

Angela Risdon  
Jaime Roberts  
S. Salzman  
Gordon Sanford  
Nancy Schaefer  
Karen Schwinn  
Mary Selkirk  
Julie Shepard  
Audrey Tennis  
Kelly Tennis  
Doug Wallace  
Scott Wilcox

Action Items and Decisions

1. The description of seasonal wetlands was expanded to include seasonal wetlands that are managed to recreate natural processes.
2. The current focus of the restoration actions in San Francisco Bay will be on the North Bay.
3. Both sides of the Petaluma River will be included in the North Bay geographical area.
4. The Delta technical team meeting was expanded to include the Mokelumne River and other east side tributaries.

5. Instream habitat was included as one of the habitat types of interest.
6. Upper watershed actions that have a direct connection to the Delta will be considered for this funding cycle, if the species and habitat priorities are met.
7. Managed agricultural wetlands will be considered as a priority during this funding cycle if they have a "nexus" to the Delta and rivers.
8. With these clarifications and changes, the Implementation Strategy was considered sufficient to guide funding decisions in this funding cycle.
9. Roundtable members may attend technical team workshops as observers, but they are not to be active participants.
10. A CVPIA Roundtable meeting will be held on March 5 at 9:30 a.m. at MWD.
11. Five to ten percent of available restoration funds can be reserved for special opportunities.

Future meetings of Roundtable are as follows:

Friday, March 14, 9:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.  
Friday, April 11, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.  
Friday, May 9, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.  
Friday, June 13, 9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

### **Draft Meeting Notes**

The informational lunch session began at 12:15 p.m. with an introduction to the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP). The purpose of the lunch session was to further explain the relationship between various CALFED entities such as the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group (ERWG), ERPP, BDAC, and other groups. Dick Daniel led a question and answer session on the relationships between these various groups and the ERPP.

Dick explained that the ecosystem common program is part of all the alternatives, even the no-action alternative, in response to a question about whether Roundtable projects would apply to the no-action alternative or whether they are mitigation of some sort. Dick indicated that, at this time, a lot of thought had not been given to the no-action possibility by the ERPP staff. There was some concern expressed that over a 5-year planning horizon there needs to be linkage to all programmatic EIS alternatives, even the no-action alternative.

Dick described the various vision statements that have been developed for each of 14 different ecological zones and gave examples of implementation objectives that would apply to each of these areas. The ERPP will also have a phasing component which will explain the plans for which actions get implemented at what time, and what indicators will be used for the monitoring

programs. Other sections of the document will include research needs and a section on the adaptive management plan. There will be a public meeting on the draft ERPP document on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

There was a concern expressed regarding the possibility of looking back on initial projects at some point in the future, and wishing that things had been done differently. Dick responded that in general a lot of what needs to be done in terms of ecosystem restoration is already known, yet he commented that we still need to try a variety of things in the restoration arena to be clear about what types of projects are most effective.

A concern was raised regarding confusion about where within CALFED stakeholders should be providing their input. Dick Daniel described that in general there have been numerous opportunities for public, technical, and policy input, all of which are funneling into the ERPP. Mary Selkirk recommended that stakeholders who are interested in long range ecosystem planning be providing input into the ERWG.

The formal Ecosystem Roundtable meeting was convened at 1:10 p.m. with a welcome and introductions by Gary Bobker. Kate Hansel began her presentation on the coordination of restoration programs (page 23 of the February meeting packet). She discussed the objective of restoration program coordination and the various methods that are used to coordinate the different programs. In addition to the coordination itemized in the meeting packet, Kate is also helping coordinate the various restoration programs by attending the CVPIA Roundtable, and Jeff Phipps of the CVPIA Roundtable has been attending the Ecosystem Roundtable meetings. Jeff gave an update on the last CVPIA Roundtable meeting, and indicated that the next meeting will be on March 5<sup>th</sup> at Metropolitan Water District's office at 9:30.

A question was raised regarding the status of the State Water Resource Control Board's Proposition 204 meeting, and their level of coordination with the Ecosystem Roundtable. Kate responded that the State Board has \$15 million in funding for Proposition 204 watershed projects. The Board will be soliciting proposals for these projects through a RFP process. The State Board is expected to send out a variety of RFPs in the near future.

The meeting continued with Cindy Darling giving a presentation on the implementation strategy and the technical teams. A handout (attached) on the planning process timeline was distributed, and Cindy explained the technical team roles and the timeline for their work. The role of Ecosystem Roundtable members in the technical teams was reviewed and, after input from legal counsel, it was concluded that Roundtable members could attend technical team workshops as observers, but they are not to be active participants.

There was some discussion of a process for getting Roundtable member input into the workplan. There will be review of the technical team workshop packets and agenda by the Roundtable members prior to the technical team meetings in order to allow some guidance of the technical process.

Cindy Darling led a discussion regarding State contracting constraints that might preclude getting the projects funded over a short time period. This is being addressed and will require additional effort. The issue of State contracting constraints needs to be resolved in order to have short-term implementation of Roundtable projects.

Cindy Darling reviewed the revised implementation strategy that begins on page 8 of the February meeting packet. She cited the changes that had been made since the last Roundtable meeting and inquired regarding the comfort of the Roundtable members to adding managed seasonal wetlands to the habitat list description of seasonal wetlands. There were no objections to this addition. Other issues to be addressed with regards to the implementation strategy included the following:

1. The role of managed agricultural wetlands (outside of the Delta).
2. Whether or not to deal with east side tributaries (Mokelumne, Consumnes, and Calaveras rivers).
3. Whether to add riverine instream habitat as a discrete habitat type.
4. Whether to include watershed management activities upstream of large dams and reservoirs as a major focus for restoration efforts.

Comments received on the implementation strategy included the following:

- The implementation strategy should take advantage of providing multiple benefits for instream habitat improvements.
- There is not yet a satisfactory resolution for dealing with upper watershed issues and how to properly invest resources in these areas. To the extent that watershed management actions have a connection to the Delta, they would be considered for funding.
- There should be an investment in healthy watershed processes for their water quality benefits and other reasons besides simply anadromous fish. A question was raised regarding whether hydrology is adequately covered in the implementation strategy.
- The strategy should include looking for short term opportunities to improve the hydrologic regime.
- The implementation strategy will acknowledge San Francisco Bay wetlands, but emphasize the North Bay and Suisun Marsh.
- The importance of the Central Bay, North Bay, and Suisun Bay for food web should be considered.
- Funds may be available to purchase water.
- Flows, gravel, habitat access, and hydrological regime all affect habitat health.

- The Roundtable should identify its comfort level for recommending flow related projects.
- The door should be kept open for linkages with other Bay programs.
- An integrated approach is needed for looking at the South Bay and other areas in San Francisco Bay.
- Data are not currently available to address flow and habitat issues in San Francisco Bay.
- It was suggested that all of San Pablo Bay and both sides of the Petaluma River be included in the North Bay geographical focus.
- There is an issue regarding the life of the implementation strategy. Is it 9 months or 5 years?
- How much instream aquatic habitat should be included in the implementation strategy?
- A test factor for the upper water shed restoration projects is to determine whether they ultimately address issues in the lower watershed and Delta.
- The implementation strategy should not define scope of the long term restoration plan. The ecosystem restoration work group can address these issues.
- Who determines what the short term issues are and addresses them? The Ecosystem Roundtable should broadly consider the restoration issues and investments. They should use the scientific background and policy considerations to refine the focus of the funding projects.
- There is need to define what the upper watershed is (eg: is it above the dams). The technical teams should define this.
- Should terrestrial species of concern be included in the implementation strategy?
- What are the initial priorities and first things to be done for the implementation strategy?
- Key terrestrial species to include in the implementation strategy were suggested. These include migratory water fowl, neotropical migrants, giant garter snakes, sandhill cranes, and shore birds.
- What type of project should be included for the fiscal year 1998 funding?
- The list of projects this year should be limited, in order to have a realistic scope and decision making process.
- Should exotic species be included in the implementation strategy?

Following the receipt of comments on the implementation strategy, the need was reiterated for addressing upper watershed issues. Lester Snow concurred with the need to address these issues, but indicated that the method by which to do that and how to link it to the rest of the system is still under discussion. Another geographical boundary issue that was raised was the emphasis, or lack thereof, on San Francisco Bay. Cindy Darling explained that there was uncertainty about the benefits of actions in the South and Central Bays for many of the species being targeted in the implementation strategy. She inquired as to whether the Roundtable members want to include and fund restoration activities in those areas at this time. Gary Bobker suggested that the Roundtable acknowledge that the Central Bay and South Bay are areas of interest for the short-term program, but at this time the emphasis in San Francisco Bay should be the North Bay. Cindy Darling concurred and suggested that the central and South Bay areas projects be tabled for approximately 6 months. It was also noted that there is limited data available in the South Bay to allow for any well supported short-term actions but this information was being developed to better define these relationships.

Regarding other geographical boundaries, it was noted that all of the Petaluma River is part of the North Bay focus, as opposed to just the eastern side. The issue of whether all of San Pablo Bay should be considered an area of major focus was unresolved.

At the end of the implementation strategy discussion, the following conclusions were reached.

- The Mokelumne River and other east side tributaries are to be included in this year's funding cycle and technical team focus.
- Instream habitat is to be included as one of the habitat types of interest.
- The San Francisco Bay restoration project focus is to be on the North Bay during this funding cycle.
- Upper watersheds that have a direct connection to the Delta will be considered for this funding cycle if the species and habitat priorities are met.
- Managed agricultural wetlands will be considered as a priority during this funding cycle if they have a "nexus" to the Delta and rivers.
- Adding migratory birds as a secondary priority species.

There was renewed discussion about adding terrestrial species into the implementation strategy document, in addition to its focus on aquatic species. The addition of a terrestrial species would broaden the funding possibilities. After some discussion there was consensus that the implementation strategy cite native fish species in danger of extinction, and other key species and migratory birds. There was an additional suggestion that this implementation strategy be characterized as a "draft 3-5 year strategy" which will be revisited on an annual basis. This resolution was suggested in response to the discussion about revising the implementation strategy

to be a one-year program so that some issues that may occur in later years could be dropped from current consideration.

#### Needs Assessment Update

There was no discussion of the update to the needs assessment. David Yardas will be working on a redraft of the two existing drafts.

#### Flood Reports and Opportunity Update

A report was available at the meeting on the Governor's flood emergency action team, dated February 10, 1997. There was no additional discussion of related opportunities.

#### Emerging Issues

Cindy Darling briefly reviewed several emerging issues, with suggestions about how they be handled. Regarding use of Category III funds for studies, Cindy suggested that these be focused on studies that lead to projects, rather than theoretical investigations. Pilot programs would be an example of a suitable study for funding. Regarding the use of Category III funds for flow related projects, Cindy noted that variations on this issue have been coming up in the technical sessions (such as operation of reservoirs and water acquisition needs). Regarding reserving a percentage of funds for projects of opportunity, there was no objection to the concept of reserving 5-10 percent of the available funds for special opportunities.

#### Federal Funding Update

Limited copies of the FY98 budget were available at the meeting. There is \$143 million in Clinton's budget for restoration activities. Future funding determinations will rely heavily on evaluation of the success of the current Ecosystem Roundtable process.

## Planning Process Timeline

Process Steps	Time Frame	Purpose	Example	Review Process
Implementation Strategy	Jan-Feb	Identify priority species, habitats, and ecosystem processes.	Spring run salmon are identified as a priority species in 1997.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ecosystem Roundtable discussion in Dec.</li> <li>2. Program Team liasons red flag review in Jan.</li> <li>3. EcoRT discussed again in Jan (unfortunately, no final advice).</li> <li>4. Management Team discussion/decision in Jan.</li> <li>5. EcoRT final advice in Feb.</li> <li>6. Presented to BDAC in March.</li> </ol>
Workplan	Mar-April	Identify limiting factors for the priorities and identify actions to address those factors.	Spring run adults cannot migrate past the diversion at Fred Smith's diversion dam and so the dam needs to be modified. The best option to improve passage is a new fish ladder.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CALFED staff prepares with input from technical teams.</li> <li>2. Program Team liaisons red flag review.</li> <li>3. EcoRT 3/14 meeting discussion, 4/11 final advice.</li> <li>4. Management Team decision in April.</li> <li>5. BDAC presentation.</li> </ol>
Project Solicitation and Development	April-May	Develop package to solicit projects to implement the actions in the workplan.	Request a proposal to construct a fish ladder at Fred Smith's diversion.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prepared by CALFED staff.</li> <li>2. Reviewed by EcoRT in May.</li> <li>3. Management Team decision in May.</li> </ol>
List of Projects and Programs	June-July	A final list of projects to be funded, including recommendations on cost sharing with other funding sources.	Approve funding for Fred Smith's proposal to build a ladder and recommend that CVPIA cost share on the project.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prepared by CALFED staff.</li> <li>2. Presented to Management Team.</li> <li>3. Presented to EcoRT.</li> <li>4. Presented to BDAC.</li> <li>5. Management Team decision (at a joint meeting with the EcoRT?)</li> </ol>
Implementation	1997 and 1998	Contracts and agreements are written and projects implemented.	A contract with Fred Smith is signed and Fred hires Joe's construction company to build the ladder.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CALFED staff or NFWF staff prepares contract.</li> </ol>

E-028798

E-028798